DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 073 EA 013 810

AUTHOR Viney, Bonnie L.; O'Reilly, Robert R.
TITLE Organizational Structure and Effectiveness in School Board Program Departments.
PUB DATE 17 Apr 81
NOTE 36p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board Administrator Relationship; *Bureaucracy; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Multiple Regression Analysis; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Organizational Theories; *School Organization
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

In 1975 the Ontario Ministry of Education assigned major responsibilities in curriculum development to local school boards. School boards responded by establishing or expanding special units to develop local programs. At the present time, the organization of these units or program departments varies widely. The focus of the present study is to determine the most effective organizational structure for this curriculum task. A brief review of the literature concerning the relationship of organizational structure to organizational effectiveness is presented. The study examines the organizational structure of 25 school board program departments on four bureaucratic dimensions: (1) configuration, or hierarchical organization; (2) specialization, or the number of functions performed exclusively by one person; (3) centralization, or the locus of decision making, and (4) formalization, or role definition in a department. A regression analysis of these variables on organizational effectiveness revealed centralization and formalization to be negatively related, hierarchical configuration positively related, and specialization not related to effectiveness. The authors explain these results in the light of previous organizational research and the unique characteristics of this sample and outline implications for educational practice. A bibliography and the instruments used to measure effectiveness and the bureaucratic dimensions are included. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206073

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND EFFECTIVENESS IN SCHOOL BOARD PROGRAM DEPARTMENTS

by

Bonnie L. Viney, Ph.D.
Carleton Board of Education
Ottawa, Canada

and

Robert R. O'Reilly, Ph.D.
University of Ottawa

Paper presented to the Annual Meeting
of the American Educational Research Association,
Los Angeles, April 17, 1981

EA 013 510

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Viney
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In 1975, with the publication of a booklet entitled "The Formative Years", the Ontario Ministry of Education assigned major responsibilities in curriculum development to local school boards, following a decentralization trend which occurred throughout North America. Although the province continued to establish educational philosophy, local officials were directed to translate that philosophy into programs.

School boards responded to this directive by establishing or expanding special units to develop local programs. Provincial policy began to be translated locally into specific objectives and curriculum guides. As the scope of the task became clearer, these units grew in many directions. Guidance from the province concerning the form such expansion should take was not forthcoming.

At the present time, the organization of these units or program departments varies widely. In some cases, one or two consultants work alone or with volunteer teacher committees. At the other extreme, some curriculum departments have become very large, organized in accordance with business management principles. The question of the most effective organizational structure for this curriculum task was the focus of the present study.

The structure of an organization, the formally sanctioned arrangement of its parts, is the visible result of conscious efforts by the organization to achieve its objectives while maintaining itself as an entity and adapting to its external environment. Structure is thus the medium through which the organization attempts to be effective. As such, it has attracted the attention of many theorists.

Early in this century, Taylor and other advocates of scientific management concerned themselves with optimum arrangements of men and machines for maximum productivity. An organization's undertakings, it was argued, should be divided and subdivided into very simple, carefully defined functions. The specific procedures to be carried out by individual workers in each division were to be clearly identified and closely controlled. Thus, through specialization and standardization, it was argued, an effective organizational structure would be achieved.

Weber's writings defined and extended the organizational principles described by Taylor and other early writers. His theory of bureaucracy identified "the purely bureaucratic type of administrative organization" as an ideal:

> From a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and ...

> formally the most rational known means of carrying out imperative control over human beings it is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability (1947: 337).

Organizational structure was therefore directly linked to organizational effectiveness.

Weber described the characteristics of his ideal bureaucracy in six areas: fixed official jurisdictional areas, ordered by rules; office hierarchy and levels of graded authority in which there is supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones; the basing of management upon written documents; thorough and expert training in management; the full working capacity of the official; and management following general rules, stable, exhaustive, and available to all (1958: 196-198).

Because of the specificity of these principles, Weber's theory of bureaucracy inspired many empirical studies of organizations. Research concerning organizational structure has focused on the presence of elements derived directly from Weber's theory; for example, configuration, centralization, specialization, standardization and formalization (Pugh et al., 1963). The present study used the Samuel and Mannheim (1970) measure of configuration and the abbreviated Aston measures of centralization, specialization and formaliza-

tion (Inkson et al., 1970). It was thus possible to describe quantitatively the organizational structure of each program department analyzed.

Organizational effectiveness is a measure of the extent of goal achievement, which is in the long run dependent upon internal maintenance and problem-solving ability combined with adaptability to the environment. Appropriate measures of organizational effectiveness vary according to the type of goal which the organization is attempting to achieve: the number of products, number of ideas, number of clients leaving or the extent of services performed may all be appropriate measures (Bennis, 1959). As Steers (1975) has argued, a static set of variables related to organizational effectiveness in general does not appear to exist. After reviewing seventeen multivariate models and finding little consistency in their evaluation criteria, he concluded that such effectiveness should be viewed in terms of operational goal attainment, which he saw as a measure of the capacity of an organization to use its resources successfully toward specific ends. In the present study, a modified Georgopoulos-Mann (1962) instrument was used to measure operational goal achievement in school board program departments.

How is organizational structure related to effectiveness? The literature suggests that three elements are crucial links: the nature of the organization's task, the character of its employees, and the environment in which it must function. Program departments were therefore analyzed in each of these areas.

The curriculum development task faced by a school board program department consists of creative idea production and problem-solving. The task is not a uniform one, and specific goals may change rapidly from day to day. Broad educational goals provided by the Ministry of Education must be translated into practical and specific curriculum guides relevant to a wide range of students and useful to many different teachers. These guides must be distributed and their implementation assisted, with ongoing evaluations and revisions completing the cycle.

This task demands a great deal of creative idea generation in response to a continually vacillating political superstructure and an extremely varied clientele. Procedures effective at one point in time for one program may be totally ineffective on another occasion when different environmental constraints, subject matter or clients must be considered.

The environment in which the program department's task is carried out fluctuates constantly. Ministerial, public, and teacher demands vary extensively and frequently conflict at any single point in time; they rarely remain stable for any length of time. The contextual variables of goals, size, control, resources and interdependence with other organizations can be changed abruptly and with little warning by the various levels of government. Program departments cannot depend upon a stable environment within which to standardize their activities.

The people employed in these departments are professional educators. They have considerable formal training, rigidly enforced certification requirements, and professional affiliations which both sanction certain types of conduct and demand certain types of participation. These employees have a service orientation, a sincere concern for client welfare, and a confidence in their own training and experience as the best basis for decision making in their own field.

Given a creative task in an uncertain environment and professional employees, it was predicted that the effectiveness of school board program departments would be related to the extent to which their organizational structures took all of these factors into account.

The creative task and unpredictable context appeared to require a problem-solving, not a mechanistic

orientation. The usefulness of a great deal of specialization within the department seemed to be limited, for the divisions appropriate for the writing of one curriculum could be totally inappropriate on another occasion. Considerable standardization and formalization of procedures seemed to be equally dysfunctional, for each subject area and grade level placed specific and unique limitations on curriculum development in comparison to other subject areas. Professional employees in any case had not reacted well in previous research to such standardization or formalization, preferring to base procedures on their own training and experience. These employees had also reacted badly to centralized decision making and highly structured hierarchies of authority. Seeing their own expertise as an appropriate authority base, therefore, these curriculum workers were predicted to demand active participation in decision making about all aspects of their work and the structure of their work environment.

It thus appeared that school board program departments structured in a less bureaucratic way in response to the nature of their task, environment and employees would be more effective than those which had a highly bureaucratized structure. The following four hypotheses were therefore tested:

I. Program departments with flat configurations have a higher degree of organizational effectiveness than departments with steeper hierarchies.

II. Program departments with low degrees of centralization have a higher degree of organizational effectiveness than departments with higher levels of centralization.

III. Program departments with low degrees of specialization have a higher degree of organizational effectiveness than departments with higher levels of specialization.

IV. Program departments with low degrees of formalization have a higher degree of organizational effectiveness than departments with higher levels of formalization.

The sample for the study consisted of twenty-five school boards with enrollments of 10,000 or greater randomly selected from across the province of Ontario. These boards constituted a homogeneous set of organizations in relation to five of the seven contextual factors defined by Pugh et al. (1963): origin and history, ownership and control, charter, technology and dependence. Location was controlled by random selection, through which five of the six regions defined by the Ministry of Education were represented. Statistical account was taken of the remaining contextual factor defined by the Aston researchers, that of organizational size.

These twenty-five program departments were examined for their level of effectiveness and degree of

bureaucracy using the Georgopoulos-Mann, Samuel-Mannheim and Aston measures. Both interviews and questionnaire methods were used. Structural data was obtained through an interview with a senior administrator familiar with the formal organization of each program department, and verified by an examination of documents. Effectiveness questionnaires were completed by all members of each board's program department. Completed structural surveys and effectiveness questionnaires were scored according to the criteria outlined by their designers.

To show the interrelationships among the independent structural variables and size, as well as among the dependent variable items concerning effectiveness, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed. As a result of the analysis of the correlations among the seven measures of organizational effectiveness, the score consisting of the average rating of Items One to Seven was used in hypothesis testing.

Interrater reliability was estimated using Fisher Z transformations of the Pearson correlation coefficients between each pair of raters on each item in each board. All correlation coefficients were significant at the 0.05 level or better. Finally, multiple regression techniques were employed to establish the relation of the effectiveness scores of the program departments to their respective measures on the four bureaucratic dimensions.

Table I

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Independent Variables[1]

Variable	1	2	3	4
Configuration	1.000			
Centralization	0.031	1.000		
Specialization	-0.179	-0.139	1.000	
Formalization	-0.365	-0.050	0.339	1.000

[1]All coefficients are not significant at the 0.05 level.

Table II

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Independent Variables and Size

Variable	Correlation with Board Size	Correlation with Log of Size
Configuration	-0.195	-0.248
Centralization	-0.042	-0.099
Specialization	0.636*	0.626*
Formalization	0.208	0.187

*Significant at the 0.01 level

Table III

Multiple Regression Analysis I

Variable	Regression Coefficient
Configuration	0.783*
Centralization	-0.209*
Specialization	0.003
Formalization	-0.026*

Table IV

Overall Significance of Regression Equation I

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Hypothesis	1.5898	4	0.3975	3.885*
Error	2.0621	20	0.1031	

*Significant at the 0.018 level

Table V

Multiple Regression Analysis II

Variable	Regression Coefficient
Configuration	0.772*
Centralization	-0.217*
Formalization	-0.024*

Table VI

Overall Significance of Regression Equation II

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Hypothesis	1.5685	3	0.5228	5.2700*
Error	2.0834	21	0.0992	

*Significant at the 0.007 level

Three of the independent variables, configuration, centralization and formalization, were found to have significant regression coefficients. The null hypotheses concerning these variables were therefore rejected. One variable, specialization, did not have a significant regression weight. The null hypothesis concerning specialization was thus not rejected.

The effects of centralization and formalization were in the predicted negative direction. The prediction that program departments with low degrees of centralization or formalization would have a higher degree of organizational effectiveness than program departments with higher levels of centralization or formalization, respectively, was therefore supported. The results of this study thus offer support for Blau's comments (1969: 252) concerning Weber's ideal bureaucratic structure: given a complicated task and highly trained workers in a setting no longer condoning rigid class distinctions, highly centralized or highly formalized bureaucratic control was not found to be the most effective method of operation.

The null hypothesis pertaining to specialization was not rejected. This variable was not found to have a regression coefficient significantly different from zero. The specialization hypothesis was based on the argument that effective accomplishment of a creative

task in an uncertain environment would require a great deal of flexibility (Bennis, 1959). Specialized divisions appropriate at one point in time, it was suggested, would therefore be totally inappropriate at another point in time. Furthermore, restrictions placed on professionals by narrowly-defined specialties would result in hostility, which would be dysfunctional.

The occurrence of two unforeseen factors suggested a dual explanation for the absence of a relationship between this structural variable and effectiveness. First, the number of specialized functions was significantly correlated with school board size, and hence with financial assets. The number of specialties in a program department was never equal, however, even in the largest and wealthiest boards, to the number of functions performed by the department. In all the boards in this sample, in fact, the definitions of specialties covered a range of curriculum areas. Hence, considerable shifting was necessary for each curriculum project. A rigid division of responsibilities, the sort of highly specialized structure which had been predicted to be dysfunctional for the curriculum development task, did not in fact exist in any of the boards studied.

A second explanation for the lack of support for this hypothesis was the reaction expressed by the

curriculum workers themselves to specialization. The predicted professional hostility to restrictive specialty descriptions simply did not exist. Instead of finding professionals hampered by rigidly specialized role definitions, this study found workers who were constantly challenged regardless of how their jobs had originally been labelled.

The regression coefficient associated with configuration was significantly different from zero; its positive direction, however, was the opposite to that predicted. The configuration hypothesis was based on the large body of small group studies (eg., Bavelas, 1968; Hare, 1976; Heinicke and Bales, 1953) which found status differences in work groups to reduce normal social interaction and support, to undermine the process of competition for respect and to distort the error-correcting function of social interaction (Blau and Scott, 1962). It was also based on organizational research, such as that by Heydebrand (1973), which related effective complex task achievement to nonbureaucratic, associational forms of administration, and on research concerning professionals, such as that by Meyer (1968), suggesting serious conflicts between the professional view of authority and the bureaucratic definition of hierarchical power.

In this study, program departments with steeper hierarchies were found to be more effective in curriculum development than departments with flatter configurations. A basis for an explanation of this unforeseen result can be found in the work of Blau (1968), Heydebrand (1973), Meyer (1968) and Stauffer et al. (1966), concerning the reaction of professionals to bureaucratic structure.

First, these researchers found professionals to have considerable confidence in their own decision-making abilities. In fact, they demanded control over every aspect of their work situation. Their full participation in decision making placed great strain on the hierarchical structure, however. In order to facilitate the volume of two-way communication which had to occur to eliminate conflict between bureaucratic and professional elements, a narrower span of administrative control and so a higher ratio of managers was necessary (Heydebrand, 1973). This narrower span of control was not so much related to closeness of supervision as it was to the debating and sharing of a large number of decisions, to freer, more open communication (Meyer, 1968). In program departments, therefore, the steeper hierarchies may have facilitiated significantly higher levels of two-way communication and so increased the effectiveness of the professionals involved in curriculum development.

A second explanation for these results was also suggested by the reaction of these particular professionals to an authority structure somewhat unusual in comparison to that found in other organizations. Professional hostility to hierarchical authority has been explained as a rebellion against legitimate as opposed to expert power (Blau, 1969). In the present study, however, the administrators were qualified in the professional as well as the administrative aspects of their work. Because of the newness of the field, professional training in curriculum work per se had only recently become available at the time of the study. Most curriculum workers in these program departments had a solid background in educational studies and experience, with only one or two courses in the theory and practice of curriculum itself. Their supervisors, as superintendents or consultants, typically had a parallel if somewhat more extensive background. Thus, while mutually respecting differing areas of experience in educational practice for the differing professional insights they rendered possible, both supervisors and subordinates in these program departments tended to regard themselves as having similar backgrounds in curriculum theory, and as breaking new ground together in curriculum practice. Given this

history, curriculum workers tended to regard their departments, supervisors included, as professional teams. The authority granted supervisors was, thus, an expert authority voluntarily granted by professionals to competent peers, rather than a legitimate authority granted by subordinates to superordinates because of the hierarchical structure. The bureaucratic dysfunction of professional hostility towards hierarchical control was quite possibly lower in these program departments than that which might be expected in other organizations.

As suggested in Weber's (1947) theory of bureaucracy, the organizational structure of school board program departments had a significant relationship with goal achievement in this study. As argued by Hall (1963) and others, it was not only the more bureaucratic extremes of Weber's elements that were associated with increased effectiveness, however. Less centralized, less formalized departments and steeper configurations were significantly related to effective curriculum development.

The implications of this study for educational practice are several. In organizing program departments administrators should be very aware of the complex nature of the curriculum task, the unpredictability of the environment in which it must be accomplished, and the professionalism of their curriculum workers.

Each of these characteristics is related to the effectiveness of certain forms of organizational structure.

The results suggest that decision making processes are of prime importance to the professionals who work in program departments. Genuinely participative approaches for all major decisions, and hence ready access to both superiors and peers, facilitating a considerable volume of communication, should be established. Steeper hierarchical structures with narrower spans of control should be arranged. Because of the constantly changing demands placed on program departments, rigidly formalized roles should be avoided. Less emphasis on written procedures and records should be sought. The degree of specialization was not related to effectiveness in this study; however, it was clear that an effective program department needed a combined range of competencies equal to the projects it attacked.

In conclusion, this study found the organizational structure of program departments to be multidimensional. Combinations of steeper configurations with lower degrees of centralization and formalization were found to be related to higher levels of effectiveness, supporting the prediction that certain requirements were placed upon these structures by the creative nature of the curriculum task, the unpredictability of the environment

in which it was achieved, and the professional workers who accomplished it.

References

Bavelas, A., Communication patterns in task-oriented groups. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968, 503-511.

Bennis, W.G., Leadership theory and administrative behavior: The problem of authority, Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1959, 4 (3), 259-301.

Blau, P.M., The hierarchy of authority in organizations, American Journal of Sociology, January 1968, 73 (4), 453-467.

Blau, P.M., The dynamics of bureaucracy, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Blau, P.M. & Scott, W.R., Formal organizations: A comparative approach, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Georgopoulos, B., & Mann, F., The community general hospital, New York: MacMillan, 1962.

Hall, R.H., The concept of bureaucracy: An empirical assessment, American Journal of Sociology, July 1963, 69 (1), 32-40.

Hare, A.P., Handbook of small group research, New York: The Free Press, 1976.

Heinicke, C., & Bales, R.F., Developmental trends in the structure of small groups, Sociometry, February 1953, 16 (1), 7-38.

Heydebrand, W.V., Hospital bureaucracy, New York: Dunellen Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.

Inkson, J.H.K., Pugh, D.S., & Hickson, D.J., Organizational context and structure: An abbreviated replication, Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1970, 15 (3), 318-329.

Meyer, M.W., Expertness and the span of control, American Sociological Review, December 1968, 33 (6), 944-951.

Ministry of Education of Ontario, The formative years, Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1975.

Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.R., Macdonald, K.M., Turner, C., & Lupton, T., A conceptual scheme for organizational analysis, Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1963, 8 (3), 289-315.

Pugh, D.S., Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.R., & Turner, C., Dimensions of organization structure, Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1968, 13 (1), 65-105.

Samuel, Y., & Mannheim, B.F., A multidimensional approach toward a typology of bureaucracy, Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1970, 15 (2), 216-228.

Stauffer, R.E., Blau, P.M., & Heydebrand, W.V., Organizational complexities of public personnel agencies, Public Personnel Review, January 1966, 27 (1), 82-87.

Steers, R.M., Problems in the measurement of organizational effectiveness, Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1975, 20 (4), 546-558.

Taylor, F.W., The principles of scientific management, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1911.

Weber, M., The theory of social and economic organization, Translated by A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1947.

Weber, M., Essays in sociology, Translated by H.H. Gerth & C. W. Mills, New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

APPENDIX 1

THE INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE BUREAUCRATIC DIMENSIONS

1.0 Hierarchical Control

This is a measure of the configuration of the organization's hierarchy incorporating (1) the height of the hierarchy, that is, the number of levels, (2) the average span of control, and (3) the cumulative authority and responsibility vested in each level -- in terms of the number of subordinates.

1.1 May I have a copy of your organization chart?

Obtained To Be Mailed

1.2 How many levels of authority are indicated on the chart/exist in this program department?

1.3 How many subordinates report to each level of the chart?

According to Reimann (1973), the hierarchical control index is computed from the following expression:[1]

$$H = S_{act} - S_{min} / S_{max} - S_{min} \quad [\text{sic}] \qquad (1)$$

where: H = hierarchical control index
S = cumulative sum of the number of subordinates at all levels.

The cumulative sum of the number of subordinates at all levels is computed as follows:

$$S_{act} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i \qquad (2)$$

where: S_i = number of subordinates reporting to the ith member of the organization ($0 \leq S_i \leq n-1$)

n = total number of members in organization (including chief executive)

The maximum value of S for a given organization size would occur if every member of the organization except the bottom one had one immediate subordinate. This would be the tallest possible hierarchical structure with maximum number of levels.

In this case:

$$S_{max} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (n-1) \qquad (3)$$

$$= (n-1)+(n-2)=__+1+0 \text{ or}$$

$$S_{max} = (n/2)(n-1) \quad [\text{sic}]$$

The minimum value of S would occur where all but one member of the organization (n-1) report to one chief executive. This would be the flattest possible structure. That is:

$$S_{min} = (n-1) \qquad (4)$$

Once the values of S_{act}, S_{max}, and S_{min} have been determined, the hierarchical structure index can readily be computed from equation (1) above.

The sum of the cumulative number of total employees at and below each level from the bottom to the top will also give S_{act}. Special assistants, secretaries and the like are considered as belonging to the level below their immediate supervisor.

This index then measures the extent to which the cumulative authority and responsibility at all the organization's levels exceeds the minimum possible.

Since this measure is expressed as a proportion of the difference between maximum and minimum possible values of cumulative authority and responsibility, the effect of organization size is partialed out.(Reimann, 1973: 475-476).

---

[1] Although this is the format in which these formulae were reported by Reimann (1973), they contain obvious errors. The correct entries should be the following:

$$H = (S_{act} - S_{min})/(S_{max} - S_{min}) \qquad (1)$$

$$S_{max} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (i-1)$$

$$= (n-1)+(n-2)+\ldots+1+0 \text{ or}$$

$$S_{max} = \frac{n\,(n-1)}{2} \qquad (3)$$

However, the fact that these formulae were published incorrectly did not influence in any way the computations that were made in this study.

2.0 Centralization Index

The degree of centralization in the organization is given by the locus of decision-making on topics from a set list as well as the degree of participation and information sharing. The score is obtained by averaging the rankings obtained for all eight items.

2.1 Locus of Decision Making (Programs Developed Any One Year)

(a)	Broad representation of supervisors and employees	1
(b)	Chief executive and supervisors	2
(c)	Chief executive alone	3
(d)	Superintendents' Council or Director	4

2.2 Locus of Decision Making (Development Process Followed Any One Year)

(a)	Broad representation of supervisors and employees	1
(b)	Chief executive and supervisors	2
(c)	Chief executive alone	3
(d)	Superintendents' Council or Director	4

2.3 Locus of Decision Making (Implementation Process Followed Any One Year)

(a)	Broad representation of supervisors and employees	1
(b)	Chief executive and supervisors	2
(c)	Chief executive alone	
(d)	Superintendents' Council or Director	4

2.4 Locus of Decision Making (Evaluation Process Followed Any One Year)

(a)	Broad representation of supervisors and employees	1
(b)	Chief executive and supervisors	2
(c)	Chief executive alone	3
(d)	Superintendents' Council or Director	4

2.5 Locus of Decision Making (Staffing Policies)

(a) Broad representation of supervisors and employees 1
(b) Chief executive and supervisors 2
(c) Chief executive alone 3
(d) Superintendents' Council or Director 4

2.6 Locus of Decision Making (Selection of Supervisors)

(a) Broad representation of supervisors and employees 1
(b) Chief executive and supervisors 2
(c) Chief executive alone 3
(d) Superintendents' Council or Director 4

2.7 The Degree of Participation in Long-Range Planning

(a) Broad representation of supervisors and employees 1
(b) Chief executive and supervisors 2
(c) Chief executive alone 3
(d) Superintendents' Council or Director 4

2.8 The Degree of Information Sharing

(a) Considerable -- general memos or information meetings on all major aspects of the department's operation 1
(b) Fair -- special reports on department's operations distributed to chief executive and supervisors only 2
(c) Little -- all information kept secret from everyone except the chief executive or a few top-level supervisors 3
(d) None 4

3.0 Functional Specialization

A function is specialized when at least one person performs that function and no other function. No account is taken of either (a) the specialist's status or (b) whether an organization has many specialists or only one. For each activity for which there is a specialist, the organization scores one.

3.1 Develop, legitimize, and symbolize the department's charter -- for example, a public relations officer, a person who advertises the services of the department to the rest of the Board, a coordinator of publications, etc.

3.2 Dispose of, distribute, and service the programs produced -- for example, a person in charge of handing out guidelines, overseeing their implementation, and collecting comments on their merits.

3.3 Carry program outlines and resource material from place -- for example, a transportation or shipping clerk.

3.4 Acquire and allocate human resources -- for example, a personnel officer.

3.5 Develop and transform human resources -- for example, a training officer or a person in charge of internal professional development.

3.6 Maintain human resources and promote their identification with the department -- for example, a magazine editor, a sports or social director, a health officer.

3.7 Obtain and control materials and equipment -- for example, a purchasing manager, or a stock control clerk.

3.8 Maintain and erect buildings and equipment -- for example, an audiovisual technician or a maintenance engineer.

3.9 Record and control financial resources -- for example, an accountant.

3.10 Control the workflow -- for example, a planning director.

3.11 Control the quality of programs produced -- for example, a proofreader, or a person who checks draft documents over before they are produced.

3.12 Assess and devise ways of developing the programs.

3.13 Devise new programs and resources.

3.14 Develop and operate administrative procedures -- for example, a person in charge of filing, statistics or research.

3.15 Deal with the legal and insurance requirements -- for example, a person in charge of obtaining reprint permission or copyrighting programs produced.

3.16 Acquire information on the operational field -- for example, a subject matter specialist, child psychologist or curriculum expert.

3.17 Process information -- for example, a person in charge of tabulating evaluation results, or of surveying available commercial programs.

4.0 Formalization of Role Definition

The degree of formalization of role definition in the department is given by the number of specific role-defining documents, from a set list, which exist in the department, and, in some cases, the extent of their application or distribution.

4.1 Information booklets given to:

None	0
Few employees	1
Many employees	2
All employees	3

4.2 Number of information booklets:

None	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4 or more	4

Total number:

4.3 Organization chart given to:

None	0
Chief executive only	1
Chief executive plus one other person	2
Chief executive plus all/ most department members	3

4.4 Written operation instructions: 1

4.5 Written terms of reference or job description:

For curriculum writers or professional development officers	1
For curriculum supervisors	1
For support personnel (clerical)	1
For chief executive	1

4.6	Manual of procedures:	1
4.7	Written statements of policies	1
4.8	Written workflow (production) schedule or program	1
4.9	Written reports on progress and activities	1
4.10	Written specialized contracts of employment	1

APPENDIX 2

THE INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

For each of the seven questions which follow, select one answer and mark it with an X.

(1) On the basis of your experience and information, how would you rate the quality of CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT that GENERALLY occurs in your program department?

__ Outstanding
__ Excellent
__ Very good
__ Good
__ Fair
__ Rather poor
__ Poor

(2) On the basis of your experience and information, how good, would you say, is the TRANSLATION OF BROAD MINISTRY OF EDUCATION GOALS INTO RELEVANT LOCAL OBJECTIVES in this program department?

__ Outstanding
__ Excellent
__ Very good
__ Good
__ Fair
__ Rather poor
__ Poor

(3) On the basis of your experience and information, how good, would you say, is the OUTLINING OF SUITABLY ORGANIZED EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES TO ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS in this program department?

__ Outstanding
__ Excellent
__ Very good
__ Good
__ Fair
__ Rather poor
__ Poor

(4) On the basis of your experience and information, how good, would you say, is the PROVISION FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN STUDENT AND TEACHER INTERESTS AND ABILITIES in this program department?

__ Outstanding
__ Excellent
__ Very good
__ Good
__ Fair
__ Rather poor
__ Poor

(5) On the basis of your experience and information, how good, would you say, is the PROVISION OF GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEARNING in this program department?

__ Outstanding
__ Excellent
__ Very good
__ Good
__ Fair
__ Rather poor
__ Poor

(6) On the basis of your experience and information, how good, would you say, is the IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE in this program department?

__ Outstanding
__ Excellent
__ Very good
__ Good
__ Fair
__ Rather poor
__ Poor

(7) On the basis of your experience and information, how good, would you say, is the EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS in this program department?

__ Outstanding
__ Excellent
__ Very good
__ Good
__ Fair
__ Rather poor
__ Poor